

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

Minutes of the
ACADEMIC SENATE
Tuesday, October 24, 1989
UU 220, 3:00-5:00pm

Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:11pm.

- I. Minutes: The minutes from the October 3, 1989 Academic Senate meeting were approved without change.
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
The Chair directed the Senate's attention to the Communications and Announcements listed on the October 24, 1989 agenda and to the reading items listed on the Academic Senate Reading List.
- III. Reports:
 - A. President's Office
 - B. Vice President for Academic Affairs
Vice President Wilson called the Senate's attention to a flier titled, "White American Student Union." He requested that if these flyers were observed to please remove them and notify his office.

From conversations with the Chancellor's Office, it appears we will have an increase of 34 faculty positions next year. Of these, 24 new positions were associated with a budgeted enrollment increase of 400 FTE students this year (this brings us to the Master Plan Enrollment ceiling for Cal Poly of 15,000 FTE students); 6.5 positions will come from a shift in instructional access by students; and 3.5 positions in partial recognition of the appropriate course classification for Cooperative Education enrollment.

In addition, with reference to mode & level staffing formulas, there is a possibility that some of the C-4 courses may shift to C-2. This is due to class enrollments exceeding the previously agreed upon limits. The faculty should look at C-3 to C-6 courses in terms of class enrollment.

Dr. Wilson also reported on his visit to Costa Rica stating that the EARTH project is going well. The Director and Associate Director have been hired and are serving in their official capacity. Dr. Rathbun, and the people involved with the project from Cal Poly, deserve a lot of credit for their good work.

C. Statewide Senators

- D. James R. Landreth, Vice President for Business Affairs, gave a report on the role of the Business Affairs division of Cal Poly. "The goal of the division is to aid the instruction, student affairs, and other programs in accomplishing and furthering their missions." As senior administrator, Mr. Landreth is the chief fiscal and business officer and responsible for planning and directing the Business Affairs division which provides 18 support and service functions. The functions are administered among five departments. Mr. Landreth then summarized the "very dynamic trends" taking place in Budget Planning and Administration (e.g., impact of lottery funds), Environmental Health and Safety (e.g., new laws, policies, and regulations), and computing systems automation.

At the Chair's request, Mr. Landreth commented on the parking fee increase and retroactive charges. He stated that the invoices received by faculty were prepared and sent at the direction of the Chancellor's Office, but the process of collection, if any, is still undetermined. This is explained in a memo from Anthony Flores regarding Retroactive Parking Fee Invoices (dated October 20, 1989) which will be sent to all Cal Poly faculty.

IV. Consent Agenda:

The Consent Agenda contains items that are noncontroversial. Per the Chair's comments, these items, "stand alone and deal with routine procedural matters." A senator has the option of pulling an item from the Consent Agenda if there is a concern or question. That item is then added to the Business Item(s) portion of the agenda. If the item has not been pulled, it is passed unanimously without a motion or vote. Most of the items that will appear on the Consent Agenda this year will be Curriculum/GE&B (Area F) items which were tabled during Spring Quarter 1989.

The following Consent Agenda items were approved:

- A. GE&B Proposal for AERO 210.
- B. GE&B Committee recommendations on IT 401/301, HIST 319X, and HE 433.

V. Business Item(s):

- A. Resolution on Evaluation Procedures and Criteria: M/S/P (P Murphy/Andrews). Three editorial changes were made as a result of comments made at the first reading.

1. On page 21, paragraph two of CAM 341.A.7, the following change was made:

~~When recommendations of the department/head/chair and/or school/PRC and/or dean~~ When recommendations at other levels of review are not in conformity with the recommendations of the department PRC...

2. On page 21, CAM 341.A.9 was changed to read:

~~Department/heads/chairs and/deans shall use the Faculty Evaluation Form (Form 109) to evaluate faculty for retention/tenure and promotion. Comments regarding student evaluations must be included in Section 1 of Form 109.~~

Deans shall use the Faculty Evaluation Form (Form 109) to evaluate faculty for retention, tenure, and promotion, as shall the heads/chairs of departments in which they are a separate level of review. Comments regarding student evaluations must be included in Section 1 of Form 109.

3. On page 22, CAM 341.B.3, the first sentence was changed as follows:

Evaluation of probationary faculty involves a "comprehensive assessment" with appointment and retention seen as leading to tenure.

The following concerns were identified during the first reading of this resolution but were not included in the committee's revisions:

- (1) Should the possibility of the MOU not being renegotiated/renewed during an academic year (leaving Faculty Unit 3 without a working agreement) be addressed in the resolution? The committee felt there was only a remote possibility of this occurring and it was therefore not addressed in the resolution.
- (2) Is it necessary for evaluators to sign both the Working Personnel Action File and the Personnel Action File? The committee felt it appropriate that each file be signed to give evidence that each file had been reviewed.

C Andrews asked if the numbering in the resolution should be 341.1 instead of 341 and whether it was intentional that Post Tenure Review had not been included in this revision. P Murphy concurred that the

numbering should be 341.1 and stated Post Tenure Review was to be covered in another section.

M/S/P (Wight/Bailey) to amend section 341.A.7 (first line on p. 21) by deleting the word "publication." The sentence now reads, ". . . significant curricular, scholarly, and committee contributions, ~~publications~~, and opinions of peers and students."

M/S (Wight/Bailey) to amend section 341.B.1. (p. 22) by deleting this last sentence of the paragraph, "Although teaching effectiveness is the primary and essential criterion, it alone is not sufficient for retention, tenure, and promotion." The motion failed.

- B. Resolution on Retention of Probationary Faculty: M/S/P (P. Murphy/Andrews). P Murphy stated that this resolution regarding retention is a continuation of last year's rewrite on promotion and tenure.

M/S (Wight/floor) to amend (p. 29) CAM 343.1.A.2 by adding the words, "with emphasis on" before the sentence, ". . . : teaching activities and performance" The motion failed.

- C. Resolution on CAM 543 Regarding Indirect Cost Sharing (ARDFA Facilities): M/S/P (Moustafa/Coleman). Moustafa identified changes made in the resolution which resulted from comments made during the first reading. In the second sentence of the fifth paragraph (p. 33), the words "research activities in the" were added and "has" was changed to "have." These editorial changes were made to reflect that some teaching is conducted in Bldg. 04. Wording changes were made in the last sentence of the Resolved clause (p. 34) to clarify the proportional share of indirect costs that should be allocated for CARE grants. This change does not alter the spirit of the resolution.

President Baker stated that this resolution addresses a problem that has existed in the university for a long time. We do not have State support for research activities. This proposal allows both students and faculty to conduct research projects without interfering with instructional space. This complements the mission of the university to support research activities. The proposal supports the concept of research overhead funds being used to develop a research facility.

Ahern recommended that the phrase in the Resolved clause of the resolution (p. 39), "applied research and

development facility" be capitalized followed by its acronym, (ARDFA), so the specific facility would be identified. There was no objection to this change by the chair of the Research Committee.

Andrews questioned how the, "up to 40 percent of indirect cost" in the resolution would be ascertained and what methodology would be applied. Stephen Hockaday stated it was his belief that this methodology would be determined by Administration and would be reviewed annually by the Research Committee.

The following motions were made by Mallareddy:

M/S/P (Mallareddy/Horton) to amend line six of the Resolved clause (p. 34) by changing the trial period from a, "three-year trial period" to a "five-year trial period."

M/S (Mallareddy/Horton) to amend line eleven of the Resolved clause (p. 34) by changing the words "the percentage" to "that" in the sentence, ". . . that is not less than the percentage allocated for CARE grants . . ." The motion failed.

- D. Resolution on Department Name Changes (first reading): Moved to a second reading at the next Academic Senate meeting. The Chair stated that at the end of the 1988-89 academic year, there were a number of resolutions requesting name changes. In order to clarify the process, the Senate requested the Vice President for Academic Affairs assist in developing procedures for submitting department name changes.

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm.